UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,320	08/18/2006	John W. Hadden	3115.00083	6669

48924 7590 08/06/2009

KOHN & ASSOCIATES, PLLC
30500 NORTHWESTERN HWY, SUITE 410
FARMINGTON HILLS, MI 48334

EXAMINER	
WEN, SHARON X	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1644	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/567,320	HADDEN, JOHN W.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHARON WEN	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 May 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *14 and 15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *14 and 15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after Final Rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office Action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/22/2009 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-13 and 16-32 have been canceled.

Claims 14-15 are currently pending.

The amendment, filed 05/22/2009 failed to meet the requirement of 37 CFR § 1.121 because claims 14 and 15 have not been provided with the proper status identifier. As noted in Applicant's remarks, filed 05/22/2009, claims 14-15 have been amended with the addition of the recitation "cytokine consisting of". However, the status identifiers state "previously presented" for claims 14 and 15. For further explanation of the amendment format required by 37 CFR § 1.121, see MPEP § 714.

In the interest of compact prosecution, claims 14-15 are currently under examination as the claims are directed to a method of immunotherapy to treat cancer by administering an effective amount of cyclophosphamide (CY) in combination with an effective amount of indomethacin (INDO) and an effective amount of cytokines consisting of IFN-γ, IL-2, IL-1, and TNF-α.

3. This Action will be in response to Applicant's Arguments/Remarks, filed 05/22/2009.

The rejections of record can be found in the previous Office Actions, mailed 02/20/2008 and 12/22/2008.

4. Applicant's sequence listing, submitted 07/15/2008, was defective. Applicant is directed to notice of **Computer Readable Form (CRF) for Sequence Listing –**

Defective, mailed 07/21/2008. Therefore, the present application stands objected to for failure to comply with sequence rules.

5. The previous scope of enablement rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment, filed 05/22/2009.

6. The previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meneses et al. has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment, filed 05/22/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The previous rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being as being obvious over Meneses et al. (*Arch. Pathol. Lab. Med.* 1998, 122:447-454) in view of Weiner et al. (PNAS 1997, 94:10833-10837) has been **withdrawn** in view of Applicant's amendment, filed 05/22/2009.

9. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meneses et al. (*Arch. Pathol. Lab. Med.* 1998, 122:447-454, reference of record) in view Nohria et al. (*Biotherapy* 1994, 7:261-269).

Meneses et al. taught a method of immunotherapy to treat head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (H&NSCC) comprising administering an effective amount of CY and INDO and a cytokine mixture comprised of IL-1, IL-2, TNF-α, and IFN-γ (see, e.g., page 447, Abstract "Patients" and page 448, Material and Methods, "Natural Cytokine Mixture" and "IRX-2 Treatment Schedule").

The difference between Meneses et al. and the present claims is that Meneses's cytokine mixture is **comprised** of IL-1, IL-2, TNF-α, and IFN-γ not **consisting of** IL-1, IL-2, TNF-α, and IFN-γ as recited in the present claims. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to pick the four cytokines recited in the claims from the cytokine list taught by Meneses et al. because it would have been obvious for the ordinary artisan to a particular combination of cytokines by selecting from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with reasonable expectation of success.

The rationale to support a conclusion that the claims would have been obvious is that a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options (e.g. the finite number of cytokines taught by the prior art used in immunotherapy for treating cancer) within his or her technical grasp. This leads to the anticipated success of treating cancer with IL-1, IL-2, TNF-α, and IFN-γ in the absence of other cytokines taught by Meneses. It is likely the product not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense.

Furthermore, using cytokines in immunotherapy has long been recognized as part of the ordinary skill of the artisan at the time the invention was made as evidenced by Nohria et al. (see entire document). In particular, Nohria taught that cytokines are attractive as potential immunomodulators in immunotherapy for immunosuppressed patients because they can be made **recombinantly** thus making them abundantly available (see page 262, right column, first paragraph). Furthermore, Nohria et al. taught that the use of cytokines may allow one to selectively enhance particular immune parameters that are needed to optimize the immunotherapy. Upon reading Nohria, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been reasonably expected to try different combination of cytokines taught by Meneses et al. for the purpose of optimizing the particular immune parameter needed for treating patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma.

It is well settled that "discovery of an optimum value of a result effective variable in a known process is ordinarily within the skill of the art." *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 276, 205 USPQ 215, 219 (CCPA 1980). Here, the result effective variable is the

different cytokine combinations chosen from the finite list of cytokines taught by Meneses et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to try different combinations of cytokines in order to fine one that optimizes the particular immune parameter that needed to be optimized for treating patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. It is also within his / her technical grasp to try these different cytokine combinations chosen from the finite choices of the cytokines taught by the prior art, with reasonable expectation of success because these cytokines were known to have immune-activating activity as taught by Nohria et al. (see sections under *Interleukin-1*, *Interleukin-2*, *Tumor necrosis factor* and *Gamma-Interferon* on pages 262-266).

Therefore the particular combination of cytokines recited in the instant claims (i.e., IL-1, IL-2, TNF-α, and IFN-γ) were obvious at the time the invention was made given that it is a well-known practice to optimize result-effective variables such as a particular cytokine combination for a particular immune parameter in immunotherapy as taught by Nohria et al.

In view of the clear teachings of the prior art to use a cytokine mixture for treating cancer in conjunction with routine laboratory optimization of immune parameter with a particular cytokine combination, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to select IL-1, IL-2, TNF-α, and IFN-γ from the finite list of cytokines taught by Meneses et al. for immunotherapy for treating cancer.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated

by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 14-15 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 5-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,977,072 ('072) in view Nohria et al. (*Biotherapy* 1994, 7:261-269).

Both sets of claims are drawn to the method of treating cancer comprising administering CY and INDO and a cytokine mixture. Claims of patent '072 differ from claims of the present application in that the cytokine mixture is not exclusive to IL-1, IL-2, TNF-α, and IFN-γ. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to pick IL-1, IL-2, TNF-α, and IFN-γ from the cytokine list recited in the claims of patent '072 because it would have been obvious for the ordinary artisan to try by choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, which reasonable expectation of success in view of Nohria et al.

In particular, Nohria taught that cytokines are attractive as potential immunomodulators in immunotherapy for immunosuppressed patients because they can be made **recombinantly** thus making them abundantly available (see page 262, right column, first paragraph). Furthermore, Nohria et al. taught that the use of cytokines may allow one to selectively enhance particular immune parameters that are needed to optimize the immunotherapy. Upon reading Nohria, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been reasonably expected to try different combinations of cytokines chosen from the finite number of the cytokines recited in the claims of the patent for the

purpose of optimizing the particular immune parameter needed for cancer immunotherapy. Therefore, the claims of the patent render obvious of the claims of the present application.

Applicant's willingness to provide the appropriate terminal disclaimer upon allowance of the pending claims has been acknowledges. However, the present claims stand rejected for the above reasons.

12. Claims 14-15 are *provisionally* rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the following:

A) claims 1-3, 11, 16-18 and 20-21 of copending application USSN 11/582,063;

B) claims 44-45, 48 and 52-54 of copending application USSN 11/374,783;

C) claims 38-42 and 52-62 of copending application USSN 11/337,358; and

D) claims 1-3, 8-9, 17-18 and 20-22 of copending application USSN 11/006,451.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the above mentioned claims of the co-pending applications and the claims of the present application are both drawn to a method of treating cancer comprising administering CY, INDO and a cytokine mixture. Although the claims of the co-pending applications do not recite the particular cytokine combination as claimed in the present application, (i.e., IL-1, IL-2, TNF-α, and IFN-γ), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select these cytokines from the finite list of cytokines recited in the claims of the co-pending applications for reasons stated above (see above 103 rejection and obviousness-type double patenting rejection against patent '072 for full analysis).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

13. No claim is allowed.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHARON WEN whose telephone number is (571)270-3064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:30AM-6:00PM, ALT. Friday, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on (571)272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sharon Wen/
Examiner, Art Unit 1644
July 22, 2009

/Ram R. Shukla/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1644

/JOHN L. LEGUYADER/
Director, Technology Center 1600